



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

in a few words as already satisfactorily treated by others. Stilo, who introduced these studies into Italy, is briefly treated (pp. 101-14). Muller believes that he did not write an *Etymologicum* like those of the Greeks, but that in his editorial and exegetical work he gave many etymologies, and perhaps compiled a glossary. His preference for the principle of *derivatio* to that of *compositio* was gradually acquired through the difference between the Greek and the Latin languages. He was more independent than his contemporaries.

Pp. 115-248 are devoted to Varro, discussing his sources, his principles and their application, his phonetics, and his semasiology. An interesting chapter gives the light thrown by Varro's etymologies on the Roman pronunciation of his day. Muller regards him as critical rather than creative.

There are two appendices, one on the twofold explanations of the same word by Varro, the other on the source of Augustine's *Principia Dialecticae*. Twenty-six theses, touching text criticism and the derivation and meaning of words, are proposed as the result of this thoroughgoing study, which is written in unusually fluent and readable Latin.

JOHN C. ROLFE

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

Cruquius und der Codex Divaei des Horaz. Von Dr. ERNST SCHWEIKERT.

Paderborn: Schöningh, 1910. M. 2.80.¹

As is well known, not only the accuracy of Cruquius but his honesty and good faith have been called in question by some. This verdict is largely based upon errors in his citations of existing codices. Dr. Schweikert, without giving special consideration to the general question of the credibility of Cruquius, makes a careful study of the conclusions which have been drawn from his readings of the Codex Carrionis seu Divaei, the Zulichemianus of Bentley. This codex has been collated, and the readings of Cruquius examined, by Fr. Matthias and J. Häussner, as well as by Holder. Dr. Schweikert submits twenty-five passages, in which these critics regard the evidence against Cruquius as especially strong, to a careful examination, and discusses twelve other passages for special reasons. His conclusion is, that while the dicta of Cruquius must be carefully weighed in each case, the judgment of Bentley is sound: "sane vir probus videtur fuisse Cruquius; neque temere fides ei detrahenda est."

It is evident that Cruquius in his commentary does not give a complete collation of all his codices, and that when he attributes a reading to *omnes codices, alii codices*, and the like, we cannot always be sure that V is included. Even the collations of Matthias, Häussner, and Holder are not always in agreement or free from error, and it is unreasonable to expect Cruquius to

¹ This price is that of Band IV, Heft 1, *Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums*, which contains also *Der Aufbau der Ars Poetica des Horaz* by Dr. Alois Patin.

have had the critical acumen and the exact methods of modern philology, or to be infallible in cases regarding which modern scholars differ in their judgments.

JOHN C. ROLFE

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

Addresses and Essays. By MORRIS H. MORGAN. New York: American Book Co., 1910. Pp. 275.

“Cita mors!” Warren, Seymour, Wright, Morgan: One thinks of them all as he takes up this small volume into which Morgan had gathered his miscellaneous publications of the last seventeen years. Advance copies of the book reached him only two days before his death. It is with a feeling of sadness that his former pupils will take up this work—the last to which their master put his hand.

Of the articles here grouped together all but the first have been published elsewhere. The arrangement of the material is outlined in the prefatory note. “Two addresses dealing with classical study in general have been placed first; then something in lighter vein; then certain detached notes followed by longer studies in an author on whom much of my time has been spent for several years; and, finally, I have ventured to add three copies of occasional verse.”

The two addresses on “The Student of the Classics” and “The Teacher of the Classics,” though “somewhat rambling” (p. 33) are full of that sound good sense for which Morgan was so well known. A thorough scholar himself, he had what so few specialists have, a saving sense of proportion. Minor imperfections could not obscure for him the great merits of Livy (p. 16), nor could the mere paraphernalia of criticism or display of erudition convince him of the value of “reconstructing” plays from the fragments (p. 33) or of marking “hidden” quantities (p. 61).

This fundamental sanity, again, is at the bottom of his satire on biographical writing in his “Real Persius” (pp. 62 ff.) and is conspicuous in his notes on Persius and Lysias. The study of *σκηνάω*, *σκηνώ*, *σκηνέω* (p. 85) grew out of his work on the vocabulary of Xenophon’s *Anabasis* and has cleared up many doubtful points in the usage of these verbs. Of these “detached notes” the most important is the one on the “Date of the Oration *Pro Roscio Comoedo*” (p. 143). In this he has conclusively proved that the date of this oration cannot be earlier than 66—not 76 as Landgraf thought. The least convincing is “Quintilian’s Quotations from Horace.” Here Morgan has undoubtedly overestimated the value of these quotations as a source for the text of Horace (cf. Cole *Classical Review* XX, 47).

The last three essays are devoted to Vitruvius. In the first, “On the Language of Vitruvius,” Morgan, by an elaborate study of the details of Vitruvius’ diction, disproves the contention of Ussing that the *De architectura*